

**REMARKS:**

In the Office action mailed October 1, 2004, the examiner rejected claims 1-21. This reply cancels claims 3 and 12, amends claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13-21, and adds claims 22-25. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13-21 are pending and under consideration.

**I. Response to § 112 rejection**

The examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This reply amends the claims to address the issue raised by the examiner.

The applicants note that the examiner did not describe which text the examiner found to be indefinite. If the examiner continues to assert that the claims are indefinite, the applicants respectfully request the examiner to point out the specific text that the examiner feels makes the claims indefinite.

**II. Response to § 102(e) rejection**

The examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,421,667 ("Codd"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

MPEP § 2131.

Claim 1 recites a flow control unit that "when receiving another event object as the result of execution of the selected action . . . selects actions to be next activated and executed" "in accordance with a type of the newly received event object." Codd does not teach or suggest this feature.

The system taught in Codd is best illustrated in column 15, line 15 through column 19, line 10 and Figures 3 and 8A-8D. More specifically, Codd teaches a "responses data store" having entries with an "executable response field" storing an executable response. See Codd, Figure 3, no. 320. Codd also teaches an expression evaluator and a task correlator that work together to identify actions to take based on the occurrence of particular types of events and conditions. See, Codd, Fig. 8B, col. 16, ll. 30-65. Neither these elements nor any other

elements taught in Codd are comparable to the flow control unit of claim 1. As Codd does not disclose all the features of claim 1, claim 1 is patentable over Codd.

Claims 7-10, 16, and 17 are patentable for at least the same reason claim 1 is patentable. Claims 2, 4-6, 11, 13-15, 18-21 are patentable at least because they depend upon patentable claims. Claims 3 and 12 have been cancelled.

### III. New claims 22-25.

This reply adds claims 22-25. Claims 22 and 23 are patentable at least because they depend upon a patentable claim. Claim 24 is patentable because Codd does not teach or suggest anything comparable to the method of operating an action execution unit described in claim 24. Claim 25 is patentable because Codd does not teach or suggest anything comparable to the method of operating a computer code execution module described in claim 25.

### IV. Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4/1/15

By: 

J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501